

13 July 1971

Dear Harold:

Many thanks for your thoughts of July 6 on the Pentagon Papers situation.

Agreed. Multiple leaks, by many and to many, over quite some period of time. Neither Fulbright, McCloskey nor Gravel bit. McCloskey and Gravel disclosed their's only after the Times broke the ice and was followed by other papers.

The following chronology may be relevant:

8 Feb. 71 -- South~~ern~~ Vietnamese invade Laos.

18 March 71 -- Retreat from Laos begins, a rout.

14 April 71 -- Richard Helms speaks to the American Newspaper Publishers Association. The NY Times says this is ~~the~~ his first public speech as CIA director and probably the first public speech by any CIA director in 10 years. The gist of it was that there is nobody here in McLean but us simpleminded bureaucrats, boss; we just collect intelligence and do what we're told and never, never make policy decisions or even recommend them.

13 June 71 -- NY Times begins publishing Pentagon Papers. A note to the second installment says the Times has had the study for "over three months," which would coincide with the rout in Laos.

If this chronology is significant, it suggests that when nobody ~~st~~took the bait and used the leaked material, Helms made his speech to prepare the scene for publication by the Times a month later. Did the administration object ?

In this connection, we have two hours of tape on a discussion by several Bay Area scholars, including notably Franz Schurman of UC Berkeley and Peter Scott, co-authors of an excellent book called The Politics of Escalation.

Their observations center around the paucity or total absence of CIA documents in the Pentagon Papers, the total absence of any clear indication of what actually took place during the three weeks between the assassination of the Diem brothers and that of JFK, and on the common thread that has run through all administrations of unvarying hostility to anything resembling a communist regime in Southeast Asia. They also note very little appears about China. This discussion was recorded during the court injunction ~~wa~~ against publication. If it sounds interesting we'll dub it on to a 120-minute cassette and send it along.

We understand the damage to the military you mention, but consider it natural. They are being told in the most demoralizing way possible exactly whom they work for.

We also appreciate your remarks about Burger and Mitchell and do not think you overestimate the situation in any way. There are many examples of their methods and tactics besides the Black Panther business in Chicago you have alluded to. Repeatedly, they have prosecuted when they had no case, and the only conclusion possible is a strategy of intimidation and tying up leadership of possible dissent. We agree that the Supreme Court decision was anything but a victory for dissent. If the press won a skirmish it has yet to win the war.

That's about it. We're sending two other separate covers to you under today's date. All together they would have been a bit bulky, as the batch sent July 10 was.

Hope at least some of it can be of some help.

Jenifer sends her best,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jenifer".

jdw